

Task Force Meeting Minutes

1

Park Hills Small Area Study

Task Force Meeting Minutes

Location: Park Hills Fire Department

Thursday, April 16, 2009

5:30 – 7:00 P.M.

ATTENDANCE:

Jay Bayer – City Engineer

Todd Berling – Local Architect

Diane Geiger – Civic Association

Joe Geiger – Civic Association

Michael Hellmann – Mayor

Ted Kleymeyer – City Council

Phil Ryan – KCPC Representative

Steve Ryan – City Council

Evelyn Stubbs – Resident

Jenna Haverkos – NKAPC – Project Manager

James Fausz – NKAPC

ABSENT:

Dr. Mark Collett – Local Business Owner – Dog's Day Grooming and Boarding

Elizabeth Dickman – Local Business Owner – Dickman Realty

Bill Gregg – Local Business Owner – Reality Tuesday

Chuck McHale – Local Business Owner – Gardens of Park Hills

Pam Spoor – Village Green Committee Chair

Leo Stamm – Local Business Owner – Fort Mitchell Garage

1. WELCOME AND MARCH MINUTES

Chairperson Ryan called the meeting to order at 5:35 P.M. Ms. Stubbs asked if the date for meeting 5 (March 16, 2009) was correct and Ms. Haverkos confirmed the date was correct. Mr. Berling made a motion to approve the meeting minutes, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Stubbs. The motion passed 8-0. Mr. Ryan abstained from voting.

2. HOUSEKEEPING ITEMS

Ms. Haverkos reminded the task force of the upcoming public meeting. She stated the date for the meeting had been set for May 14, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. and that the meeting would take place at the Covington First Church of the Nazarene. She informed the task force that the second public meeting would take the place of the regularly scheduled May task force meeting. Ms. Haverkos also stated the meeting would consist of breaking into groups consisting of 8-10 participants, having the staff member and task force representative(s) explain the different scenarios, and then gather thoughts and comments from the public on each alternative.

3. INTERIM REPORT DISCUSSION/APPROVAL

Chairperson Ryan moved the meeting along to a discussion of the Interim Report. Ms. Haverkos asked if everyone had a chance to read the report and if there were any questions about the document. Seeing as there were no questions Mr. Kleymeyer motioned to approve the report. Mayor Hellmann seconded the motion and the motion passed 9-0.

4. ALTERNATIVES – OVERALL THEMES

Ms. Haverkos next entered into a discussion of the study alternatives. She described that the feedback staff would like to receive is based on the overall concepts themselves, not specific design ideas such as driveway locations or building access points. She also mentioned that the alternatives should not be considered site plans and that they have not been engineered.

a. Neighborhood Vehicular Access

Ms. Haverkos stated that one of the items missing from each of the three alternatives is a vehicular access road into the neighborhood. She asked if the task force would be open to showing one alternative with a vehicular access. The task force mentioned they feared significant resistance from the community over the idea of the proposed road. Ms. Geiger asked for elaboration as to why there would be resistance. Ms. Haverkos stated adding the road would likely mean loss of a home or property to connect to the existing street network. Mayor Hellmann also expressed his concerns of the road becoming a cut through to Devou Park.

Ms. Haverkos stated that in internal discussions with other planners at NKAPC, questions always came up as to why there was no added connectivity to the neighborhood. Staff felt a new road would be beneficial to members of the neighborhood as they would not have to drive as far to get into the redeveloped area. She also stated that none of the alternatives show specific residential areas because staff felt residential areas were always an afterthought because of the lack of connectivity to the neighborhood. Mr. Kleymeyer stated he would not want to see a highway into the neighborhood but thought showing some sort of well-designed vehicular connection might be beneficial.

Mr. Fausz discussed a scenario where a neighborhood resident living near city hall would have to travel out to Dixie Highway by either St. James Avenue or Arlington Road to get into the redeveloped area. He elaborated by saying the scenario could be detrimental because it increased traffic along Old State Road and Dixie Highway. After discussing the possibility the task force agreed the idea should to the public in one concept.

Ms. Haverkos asked if sending the new alternative out by email would be appropriate or if the task force would like to see the scenario in person. Chairperson Ryan stated he felt it would best be discussed in a face-to-face meeting so that alternatives were not inadvertently released to the public with no added discussion of the thought process behind the scenario. Ms. Haverkos suggested a second meeting to discuss this issue on April 30 and the task force agreed.

b. Parking

Ms. Haverkos stated that staff worked to provide adequate parking throughout all of the scenarios. She discussed that parking layouts shown on each of the scenarios represent 80% of the number of spaces required by current zoning regulations. She elaborated that the 20% reduction was promoted because of parking needs that vary throughout the business day (offices vs. restaurants, residential vs. retail, etc.). She also mentioned that each of the alternatives show areas where additional parking could be added if necessary.

c. Dixie Fix Recommendations

Ms. Haverkos stated that all alternatives advocate implementing recommendations put forth by *The Dixie Fix* study. She elaborated by stating curb cuts in the northern section of the corridor had been defined and consolidated to improve safety. She also outlined the recommendations of reducing the number of travel lanes from four to two and adding a median, realigning the curve in front of the Fort Mitchell Garage, and adding provisions for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

d. Green Infrastructure

Ms. Haverkos mentioned that staff has been in contact with SD1 regarding steps to implement stormwater management within the recommendations. She added staff would again meet with SD1 to discuss specific recommendations and levels of best management practices after the preferred alternative was selected.

5. ALTERNATIVES – SPECIFIC SCENARIOS

Ms. Haverkos began discussing the specific scenarios by showing highlights of the three alternatives in the north and south ends of the corridor and where they differ from one another. She mentioned that some scenarios show keeping more of the existing structures where others provide for more new construction. She indicated that each scenario provided in some manner for plazas or gathering spaces. She also pointed out that the major intersections leading into the redeveloped areas would include some sort of stamped pavement or brick pavers to indicate secondary gateways.

Ms. Haverkos indicated that each of the alternatives showed the “land swap” for moving the parking area near Dixie Highway in front of Covington Catholic High School (CCHS). Ms. Haverkos also indicated that no scenarios showed development in front of Notre Dame Academy (NDA) due to potential topographic constraints. She added that the lack of development in front of NDA was designed to serve as a natural gateway feature and helped draw a motorist’s eye to new development in the core area. Mr. Berling suggested at least one alternative should show development in front of NDA in order to gather public input about the idea. Ms. Haverkos agreed and stated staff would include potential development scenarios on two of the alternatives. Mr. Berling asked if all of the alternatives would be included in the final report. Ms. Haverkos replied that all of the concepts would be in the report, likely as an appendix in the final document.

Mayor Hellmann asked if some sort of pedestrian access could be shown on the north end of the corridor. The task force decided access should be shown on all the alternatives and the most beneficial place to provide access would be down the old access road for the Park Hills School. Mayor Hellmann also recommended showing some sort of graphic to represent the gateway features at the entrances to Park Hills.

Ms. Haverkos moved the conversation along to a discussion of the core areas of the scenarios. She presented the idea of instituting an iconic feature (bell tower, flags, clock tower, playground, etc.) to help draw the eye into the development from Dixie Highway. She also described the ideas of congregated parking that could help to promote walkability, the use of alternate modes of transportation, and green infrastructure. Mr. Fausz described the ability to block off specific parking areas to allow for festivals or special events.

After the brief presentation of the overall themes Ms. Haverkos asked task force members for their thoughts. Mayor Hellmann began by asking about the different realignments of the Arlington and South Arlington intersections. Mr. Fausz stated the different alignments were conceptual ideas that could be moved north or south on Dixie Highway depending on the needs of the redevelopment scenario. He stated certain realignment scenarios could be more problematic to construct than others due to topography. He added the general idea was to show the intersection should be realigned in some way to reduce the number of access points onto Dixie Highway and provide greater safety to motorists.

Mr. Berling asked if any of the scenarios make an effort to keep the existing buildings in the core area. Ms. Haverkos answered that each of the scenarios show revitalization of the core area. Mr. Fausz added that each of the scenarios have a loop road that parallels Dixie Highway. He continued by stating that each of the alternatives could be built in phases where the existing structures remained in tact until there was a need for redevelopment. Ms. Haverkos questioned whether participants would lean toward the existing scenario because it was familiar. It was decided that it could be beneficial to show the existing structures and Ms. Haverkos stated staff would create a scenario that retains existing structures.

Mayor Hellmann stated he would like to have the parallel road be a slower speed road so that pedestrians felt comfortable crossing the street. Ms. Haverkos answered that the roads have been designed in each scenario to keep speeds down and implement traffic calming devices such as on-street parking.

Ms. Geiger asked about symmetry of design in the alternatives. She commented that the scenario that kept most of the original buildings in the north end of the corridor seemed unbalanced. Mr. Fausz replied the scenario was designed to allow visibility from Dixie Highway into the development so the farthest buildings could be seen. Mr. Kleymeyer suggested switching the building and greenspace location in order to better accommodate drivers.

Mr. Kleymeyer asked how developers would feel about constructing buildings with odd angles. Mr. Bayer stated he believed the buildings would be difficult to build and expensive to rent. Ms. Haverkos added the alternatives are conceptual and they could look very different when developed but still retain the same concepts.

Mr. Bayer suggested creating a scenario where access was provided off Rosemont Avenue for residential buildings. He also thought infill residential buildings would be beneficial to that scenario. Ms. Haverkos stated staff would create an alternative showing his request.

6. CONCLUSION

Ms. Haverkos reminded the task force the next meeting to review the fourth alternative would take place on April 30, 2009 at 5:30 p.m. The meeting ended at 6:40 p.m.