

Crescent Springs Small Area Study

Task Force Meeting Minutes

Location: NKAPC Commission Chambers

Tuesday, March 17, 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

Jim Collett – Mayor of Crescent Springs

Matthew Damon – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Villa Madonna Academy

Andy Eisner – Crescent Springs Resident

Eric Haaser – Crescent Springs Resident

Dawn Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident

Matthew Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Covington Latin

Daniele Longo – Crescent Springs Resident

Louis Prabell – Crescent Springs Resident

Mark Rogge – Crescent Springs Resident / KCPC Representative

Scott Santangelo – Crescent Springs City Council Member

Scott Siefke – Co-owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area

Steve Steinbrunner – Crescent Springs Resident

Bill Toebben – Owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area

Tom Vergamini – Crescent Springs City Council Member

Edward Dietrich – NKAPC – Project Manager

Keith Logsdon – NKAPC

James Fausz – NKAPC

ABSENT:

Ben Bratton – Local Resident

Bobby Chipman – Crescent Springs Resident Residing Within Study Area

Bob Mueller – Crescent Springs Resident

George Ripberger – Crescent Springs City Employee

Greg Sketch – Crescent Springs Resident

1. INTRODUCTION

a. Welcome to the Crescent Spring Small Area Study Task Force

The meeting began at 6:00 P.M. with Mr. Logsdon welcoming everyone to the Crescent Springs Small Area Study. He briefly mentioned that task force meetings would be held in the NKAPC Commission Chambers and public meetings would be conducted at the Crescent Springs City Building. He then introduced

NKAPC staff for the project; Edward Dietrich serving as the Project Manager and James Fausz as the Assistant Project Manager.

Mr. Dietrich next discussed that the study would use electronic communication methods as much as possible to limit the amount of paper used. He also spoke about utilizing the Internet for task force members to download materials, rather than clogging email boxes with large attachments. Next, he discussed the project would encompass approximately 10-12 months to complete depending on factors such as the amount of discussion in task force meetings. Finally, he mentioned some months may require more than one meeting in order to address special issues such as the Market Study.

b. Introduction of Task Force Members

Mr. Dietrich asked members of the task force to introduce themselves to each other by stating their name, occupation, why they were interested in serving on the task force, and to describe their last purchase in the study area. The responses were as follows:

Name	Occupation	Interest	Last Purchase
Steve Steinbrunner	Marketing at P&G	Resident	Dinner at McDonald's with family
Tom Vergamini	Attorney	City Council member & Chair of Long Range Planning Committee	Dinner at McDonald's with family
Scott Santangelo	Director of Operations at Music Hall	City Council member & Member of Long Range Planning Committee	Coffee at McDonald's
Daniele Longo	Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce	Resident	Gasoline at Sunoco
Mark Rogge	Civil Engineer	Resident / KCPC Representative	Cigars at Crescent Springs Tobacco Shop
Bill Toebben	President of Toebben Companies	Owner of businesses in study area	Sandwich at McDonald's
Louis Prabell	Commercial Real Estate Lender at Park National Bank	Resident	Shirts at Embroider Me
Bobbie Baker	Retired	Resident of the study area for 31 years	McDonald's
Barrie Creamer	Court Reporter	Resident of the study area	Subway
Dawn Johnson	Secretary	Resident	Burger King
Matthew Johnson	Student at Covington Latin	Resident	Burrito at Chipotle
Scott Siefke	Co-Owner of Overhead Door	Business owner	3-way from Goldstar

Matthew Damon	Student at Villa Madonna Academy	Resident	Subway Sandwich
Joe Baker	City Attorney	Business owner	Lunch at Rima's
Edward Dietrich	NKAPC Staff	Project Manager	Burger King Sandwich
James Fausz	NKAPC Staff	Asst. Project Manager	Subway Sandwich
Keith Logsdon	NKAPC Staff	Deputy Director LRP	Subway Sandwich

2. SWOT Analysis

Mr. Dietrich next asked the task force members to conduct a brief Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis on index cards. He explained that strengths and weaknesses are items that are specific to the site itself and opportunities and threats are items that are outside the study area. The task force was then provided approximately five minutes to provide responses on their index cards.

3. Introduction of Small Area Studies

Immediately following the SWOT analysis Mr. Dietrich provided the group with an overview of small area studies. He described that small area studies are a more detailed study of an area for part of the overall comprehensive plan, which is required by KRS 100. He explained that small area studies typically examine items such as capacity planning, contemporary places, and green infrastructure. Mr. Dietrich also outlined the process for having a small area study approved. This process includes: task force approval, city council approval, NKAPC approval, and then approval by the Kenton County Planning Commission (KCPC), which allows the plan to become a part of the overall comprehensive plan.

Mr. Prabell asked for clarification on the level of detail the small area study will attempt to describe. Mr. Dietrich and Mr. Logsdon explained the plan is the task force's plan and the level of detail could be as detailed as they would like it to be. Mr. Santangelo added the entire project is conceptual and that the city does not have preconceived notions as to what should happen in the area, but rather the idea is to collaborate and come up with a plan that is agreed upon by the parties involved. Mr. Vergamini added the Comprehensive Plan the study incorporates into serves as the criteria a development has to meet in order to be approved.

Mr. Dietrich described how the specific area of Crescent Springs was identified as an area in need of further analysis. He provided excerpts from the 2001 Comprehensive Plan (pg. 5-45) and 2006 Comprehensive Plan Update (pg. 174) that identified the area as a location in need of revitalization. Ms. Johnson asked if the long term land use changes recommended were put forth by the city. Mr. Vergamini responded the changes were put forth by the city's Long Range Planning Committee.

Mr. Dietrich briefly outlined the study timeline. These items included: introduction, visioning / conceptualization & goal setting (market study input), existing conditions (market study input), interim report, case studies, scenarios (market study input), final report, adoption process. Mr. Vergamini asked if certain aspects of the study were impossible to change such as utility location or street layout. Mr. Dietrich responded it would be possible to change these items but the task force would have to weigh if the benefits were greater than the costs.

4. Study Area Boundaries

Mr. Steinbrunner entered into the discussion of the study area by asking how the study boundary was set and if it could be changed. Mr. Dietrich replied that staff recommends the boundary expand to include the development on the east side of Buttermilk Pike between the railroad and I-71/75. Mr. Vergamini expanded on the study area discussion by stating the main study area was defined for study because it had not been planned for in the past. Mr. Santangelo added the main study area is viewed as the doorway to the community and the first impression on visitors is important and must be planned for to better guide future developers.

Mr. Dietrich went onto explain the redevelopment of the west area could greatly impact the redevelopment of the east area. He elaborated on the idea by stating the development on the east side of Buttermilk Pike has high vacancy rates and it could be a good asset to modify land use areas on both sides of the roadway. He also presented the idea that high-volume restaurants located in the western area could move to the eastern side, thus allowing for more efficient flow on Buttermilk Pike. Mr. Toebben countered that current zoning allowed restaurants to be located on the east side of the highway but the free market economy drove the development to be in the location best suited for their business. Mr. Santangelo replied he believed McDonalds would be unlikely to move since they just built a new facility for their business. Mr. Fausz answered that it is important to keep in mind the study is looking at a 20-30 year plan and that today's new facilities might need to be redeveloped in the future. He added that any recommendations for Buttermilk Pike would be best served if they addressed access into both the eastern and western sides of the area. Mr. Rogge commented he believed the two areas to be complimentary and what happens on one side of Buttermilk Pike affects the other side.

Mr. Vergamini asked if adding the area on the east side of Buttermilk Pike would require the city to pay a higher price for the study. Mr. Logsdon replied modifying the study area to include the eastern portion would not increase the cost of the study. Mr. Vergamini asked if expanding the study area would require adding a task force member. Mr. Dietrich replied he believed discussing the area with TANK and the property owner in key person interviews would be sufficient.

Mr. Baker questioned whether the area on the far southwestern side of the study area boundary should be included. Mr. Dietrich explained the area is outside the jurisdictional boundaries of Crescent Springs (unincorporated Kenton County and Crestview Hills) and cannot easily be added to the official study. Mr. Fausz added that including the areas would be difficult because the addition would require two extra sets of public meetings to be added to the comprehensive plan. Mr. Dietrich finished by mentioning the area would be included in the text of the document in an "Areas of Influence" section.

After discussion had concluded the task force agreed to include the area on the eastern side of Buttermilk Pike in the study and to leave the southwestern section that includes unincorporated Kenton County and Crestview Hills out of the official study.

5. Discussion of Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Dietrich briefly outlined the responsibilities of the chair by saying their role is to help keep the meeting moving, oversee the process of the meetings, and to help in soliciting the input of task force members at key points of the discussion. He also mentioned the vice chair would have the same responsibilities in the event the chair was absent. After the discussion he asked if anyone was interested in taking on one of the roles. Mr. Vergamini volunteered to serve as vice chair but declined to serve as chair on the basis that he felt the role should be filled by someone outside of city council.

6. Attendance Requirement

Mr. Dietrich briefly discussed the idea of including an attendance requirement for voting on the final report document. He asked task force members to keep the idea in mind and to decide at the next task force meeting.

7. Study Name & Logo

Mr. Fausz entered into a discussion of the study name and logo by stating staff usually starts at a base name, which in this instance was the Crescent Springs Small Area Study. He described the initial logo design ideas reflected the city logo through its circular shape. He also mentioned that staff based the design off historic rail logos to pay tribute to the rich railroad heritage in the city.

Mr. Fausz also described potential names for the study as: Crescent Springs Small Area Study, Crescent Springs Uptown Study, Crescent Springs Front Door Study, Crescent Springs Gateway Study, and Crescent Area Study.

Ms. Johnson asked if there was an advantage to naming the study something other than the Crescent Springs Small Area Study. Mr. Dietrich replied an advantage is to differentiate studies. He described the conflict of potentially having multiple small area studies in Crescent Springs as one potential problem because they could all be named the "Crescent Springs Small Area Study." Mr. Santangelo added the study name and logo should be viewed as branding the study. He believed branding the study could be useful in terms of newspaper articles, press releases, or simply for the people of Crescent Springs.

Mr. Santangelo continued that he liked a name that incorporates "gateway" because council often refers to the area as a gateway to Crescent Springs. Mr. Longo countered that he thought the name might be associated with Gateway Community and Technical College. Ms. Johnson also felt it could be confused with the City of Covington as they are often referred to as a gateway. Mr. Logsdon added that NKAPC recently finalized the Linden Gateway Small Area Study and that some could confuse the two studies if they had similar names.

Ms. Baker questioned where the name uptown originated as she had not heard the area referred to in that manner before. Mr. Dietrich replied that staff saw the name in the newspaper article announcing the study.

Mr. Santangelo suggested waiting on discussing the name further until the next meeting as he believed branding the area is important. Mr. Fausz added the study name might be something to discuss via email.

Mr. Logsdon asked task force members about their thoughts surrounding the logos. Members commented: the logo looks half done (because of the “C” shape of the outer ring), that it looks too industrial, and that it is too old fashioned. They also added the new logo idea could be softer and more contemporary. Mr. Fausz finished by stating he would wait to redesign the logo until the task force decides on a more definite name for the study.

8. Market Analysis Presentation Date

Mr. Dietrich informed the task force the market study presentation would be on either March 24 or March 26. After discussion of potential conflicts among the task force members, the group decided, by a show of hands, to hold the meeting on March 26 at 6:00 p.m. in the NKAPC Commission Chamber.

9. Preparing for our Vision

Mr. Dietrich next presented some visual examples of planning ideas that could be incorporated into Crescent Springs. The ideas he displayed were planned for areas that are in the immediate vicinity of high-noise areas such as interstate highways or railroads. Mr. Toebben suggested it might be beneficial to obtain aerial images of the post-construction developments to see how they were constructed. Mr. Dietrich finished by showing two images that show the actual views from Interstate 71/75 and Buttermilk Pike of the current state of development and asked the task force to think about how they would like the area to look in the future.

10. Conclusion

Mr. Vergamini requested staff to provide the task force with the tentative calendar of meetings. Ms. Johnson asked if additional information could be provide about GEM Public Sector Services and what they bring to the study. Mr. Santangelo answered GEM is conducting the background demographic data that helps direct what should be in the study are over approximately the next 5 years. He also stated the information from GEM guides the planning process. Mr. Vergamini added GEM’s information serves as a short term guide and that most new retailers would conduct much more in-depth analysis if they were interested in developing on the site. Mr. Logsdon also stated that it might be possible to update the market study information in 6-7 years at a lower cost.

Mr. Santangelo reminded everyone the market study meeting was scheduled for March 26, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. at NKAPC. Ms. Baker made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. Haaser. The meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.