

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
November 8, 2022
7:00 P.M.

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mr. Okum, Chairman.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dave Okum, Steve Galster, Bob Diehl, Tom Hall,
Megan Sullivan-Wisecup, Joe Ramirez, Don Darby

Staff Present: Carl Lamping, Building Official; Shawn Riggs, City Engineer;
Liz Fields, City Planner

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING ON OCTOBER 11, 2022

Motion to approve the minutes was made by Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup. Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

Voice vote taken and the minutes were approved.

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup presented her report on Council from the November 2, 2022 regular Council meeting.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE - NONE

VII. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. CITY OF SPRINGDALE CONNECTIVITY PLAN
11700 SPRINGFIELD PK
(Application #20221406)
PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Kuchta introduced the main speaker as Eric Anderson with KZF Design, Director of Planning Services, and explained what he will be going over.

Mr. Anderson presented the City of Springdale Connectivity Plan. He explained that the city initiated this project for two core reasons.

1. The Springdale Comprehensive Plan calls for a well-connected and cohesive connectivity network.
2. There is a lot of new development proposed in the city and there is a need to evaluate the way that people walk and bike throughout the city. There is a desire to connect some of the residential areas with these new commercial or residential developments.

Mr. Anderson then explained the project was guided by goals that were developed by a stake holder team of city staff. The five goals include:

1. Establishing a west to east connection for residents to access other neighborhoods, parks, schools, and areas of commerce.
2. Providing adequate pedestrian and bike infrastructure throughout the city.
3. Improving existing transportation corridors to promote safe, multimodal facilities for all users.
4. Prioritizing connections to regional pedestrian and bike facilities, as well as neighboring cities and villages.
5. Creating a continuous network of safe pedestrian and bike paths along major transportation routes.

He continued to explain how they went through a seven month planning process that included mapping and evaluation of existing conditions, community engagement, development of recommendations, and then presenting those recommendations to the

public. Two in-person open house events were held to get feedback on both existing conditions and the recommendations. In addition, they used an online mapping tool to present the same information and get feedback along with the in-person meetings. The online mapping tool included a survey much like the in-person meetings. Mr. Anderson then gave an overview of the presentation on the screen.

Mr. Anderson explained that KZF made recommendations in the form of short and long term options. The short term will be routes that the city will focus on over the next 5-10 years. When annual grant application rounds come up these will be what the city wants to make decisions on including these potential projects in an upcoming round of grant applications, implementation would be wrapping up as some of the early phases of proposed developments are coming out and coming online, such as Artisan Village and they would offer connectivity to some of those new developments. Long term will be routes that the city will focus on over the next 10+ years. These routes will get implemented as property redevelops, as feasibility studies are completed, as long term budgets for the city are developed, or as future projects are proposed.

Mr. Okum asked if there was a reason that the leg going down on that borderline somehow getting south isn't showing some way that that will eventually tie that together so that there would be some connection to that trails system.

Mr. Anderson stated that KZF focused on the primary transportation corridors as part of their study instead of going through the fields.

Mr. Okum asked about the painting on the pavement, is that an ODOT standard on how the paths are marked?

Mr. Anderson responded that ODOT allows them.

Mr. Okum then asked if that was a standard around the state.

Mr. Anderson stated that the markings have been universally adopted as a way to indicate that bikes are in the roadway with vehicles and typically they would be partnered with signage on the side of the street.

Mr. Okum asked should we be looking at concrete for people and blacktop for bikes.

Mr. Anderson stated that is typical, but you will also want to look at how much things cost because the cost for concrete vs. asphalt pavement is all over the place right now. Concrete is more durable and that's why it is used most on sidewalks and asphalt is typically used for the shared use paths because it offers a smoother ride.

The Mayor stated that the city is pretty excited about this. He also stated that when the city was contemplating moving the Community Center over to Princeton Pike he told them to do that we have to have an overpass. He also told Brian Uhl to find out who paid for the overpass in front of Northgate Mall. Brian came back the next day and stated the State of Ohio paid for that overpass. The Mayor then stated that he really urged the Commission to support the plan and recommend it to Council and he will be saying the same thing to City Council once it hits the floor there.

Mr. Diehl asked if there was a rough time table for all of this.

Mr. Anderson stated the short term recommendations were felt like they could be constructed in the next 5-10 years. The long term plan would likely be 10+ years or as property redevelopers you could try to get some of these facilities constructed or start constructing them on our own in other areas. It will really be up to the city's appetite and how much they want to build and how quickly they want to build it.

Mr. Diehl asked assuming we wanted to just go ahead with the whole project now what would we be looking at price wise.

Mr. Kuchta stated he added up all the line items in the report and with the current cost estimate for right of way acquisition, engineering, design, and construction in today's dollars. The total was around 45 million dollars. Therefore, we are not going to get it all done at once. He stated that his belief is that we are going to be planning segment by segment, probably going with the highest bang for the buck segments, the heaviest traveled segments, the ones that are going to provide the most important connections, like from the Artisan Village area south along Princeton Pike and go west on Kemper Rd.

over to Lawnview. That would probably be close to the top of the list to figure out how we approve that connectivity. That will be a separate contract, probably with CT for engineering and design. He stated that his expectation is that any engineering contract is going to say “ok, design that and tell us what that cost is and then come up with another option or two that is less costly, all the way down to shared lanes”. So the City Administration and City Council will know what their budget options are and how to proceed. That will be done segment by segment by segment, so this plan is not meant to be a final design. This is the first step in showing the regional players, like OKI, that we want to partner up with them and we’ll hopefully get some connecting segments included in regional plans as we move forward.

Mr. Diehl asked when they thought there would be a shovel in the ground.

Mr. Kuchta stated that will depend entirely on the city. Between City Administration and elected officials identifying which segment we want to try to tackle first, putting aside the money in an annual budget to pay for that engineering and design work to be done and then getting it done. He stated this has not been discussed for the 2023 budget that he is aware of, so it would have to be found money if we wanted to move on it next year or reallocation of some funds if it became a high enough priority.

Mr. Riggs stated that Northland Blvd. construction project was approved a little over a year ago. When we first started the project, there was always a vision to redesign the roads such that the wide median is now a water quality improvement project. We were also filling in pedestrian gaps with extending sidewalks along the corridor. Since the start of this plan we were asked by Administration to take another look at it, they identified this needs to have a shared use path, so Mr. Riggs and his team have been taking another look at what it would take to add a shared use path to the Northland Blvd. project. So there is a partially funded project on Northland that could be the first project included in the Connectivity Plan. That looks to go to construction in 2025.

Mr. Galster asked does it make a difference what type of lane we’ve constructed that would make it more likely for OKI or other funding sources to fund it. Is one type of construction viewed more likely to be funded over another?

Mr. Anderson stated that there is not prioritization over the types of facilities between on road, off road, separate from the road.

Mr. Riggs stated the new funding program does give different points based on the type of facility.

Mr. Galster stated most of the roadway projects that have been done in the last 10-15 years have been driven by when we can get funding for them. He then asked if we need to look at that to be incorporated into some of our design thinking.

Mr. Riggs stated at this level this is just the base and we are going to have to build off this and each situation is going to be different. We have to look at what the community wants on that facility at the time and opinions change over the years and a lot of times if you build one and see the success of that one people will change their minds and begin to like it. So we will have to continue to evaluate it as we move forward, but for now this plan does a good job of setting the base of what we need to be looking for. It really does help with the funding applications.

Mr. Okum thanked everyone who has been involved in this Connectivity Plan.

Mr. Lamping stated we ought to hear what staff has to say.

Mr. Riggs stated there were two things that came out in his review:

1. The existing condition map across from Springdale Elementary shows there is an existing multi use path, but when you look at the site it looks like there is only a 6’ wide sidewalk that goes across, so just a minor update that needs to reflect the actual conditions in front of the school.
2. Instead of saying “minimum” saying “recommended minimum”. That way it is clear for anyone trying to interpret this plan down the road and it provides some flexibility.

Ms. Fields stated she wanted to recommend to the board to also consider updating the Thoroughfare Plan, Subdivision Regs., and possibly the Zoning Code, to both implement the Comprehensive Plan recommendations but also ensure that the recommendations of this plan can be made into requirements and not recommendations.

Mr. Okum then closed the public hearing and stated he would entertain a motion to approve the following project:

The City of Springdale Connectivity Plan case #20221406, per the specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits of the plan, which were submitted by the City of Springdale and reviewed by staff. Where this approval of Planning Commission is referring this to City Council for consideration. This motion includes the following conditions: Staff, our City Engineers recommendations and considerations contained in their reports.

Motion to approve was made by Mr. Galster. Seconded by Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup.

Roll was called and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.

- IX. DISCUSSION - NONE
- X. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT - NONE
- XI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup moved to adjourn. Mr. Hall seconded.

Meeting was adjourned with a voice vote of 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2022 _____
Dave Okum, Chairman

_____, 2022 _____
Bob Diehl, Secretary