



PLAN CLAYTON IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2021

I. Opening of Meeting

Chairman Foley called the PLAN Clayton Implementation Committee meeting to order at 7:03 PM on Wednesday, April 7, 2021 virtually on the Zoom platform.

Roll call for members: Stevens-yes, Bachman-yes, Powless-yes, Williams-yes, Craddick-yes, Muncy-yes, and Foley-yes.

Members of the City's staff were also in attendance: Amanda Zimmerlin, City Manager; Kevin Schweitzer, Finance Director; Randy Sanders, Public Service Director; Jack Kuntz, Director of Development; and Seth Dorman, City Planner.

II. Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting

Chairman Foley presented the minutes of the March 10, 2021 meeting. Motion by Bachman to approve the minutes as presented, motion was second by Powless. All yeas, motion passed.

III. Old Business

None

IV. New Business

Tonight's meeting was a roundtable discussion with city leadership on Implementation Plans for each sub-committee's project list.

Before the discussions, staff members each introduced themselves to the committee.

Walkable Neighborhoods

Stevens stated they would like to cross off the plan to install a sidewalk/path from Taywood to Main Street on Old Salem. After driving that route, it does not seem realistic. After discussion it was decided not to remove the item but instead move it to the bottom of the list. Kuntz suggested a better option would be to connect the neighborhoods to Main through other areas. Powless stated this was number 3 on their list, I believe our first action should be to complete the sidewalks along Main Street.

Kuntz stated a sidewalk along Old Salem from Garber to Main is do-able and would recommend it be in the five-year plan and possibly include it in the Phase II Main Street project.

Sanders stated he received a quote to connect the sidewalk between the Crescent Ridge complex to Casey's along SR49, it would run \$89,000.

Bachman asked if we could bid out multiple small chunks, smaller projects?

Sanders stated yes and they would come in with a lower cost.

Powless asked what is in the city's CIP?

Schweitzer advised street paving, curbs and gutters, striping, major equipment purchases, capital leases, debt payments, changing over of street signage, etc.

Sanders advised he and Seth had a conversation with a representative from ODOT in regard to the Safe Routes to Schools funds. They were informative and said the area around Noranda would be a viable project to fill in missing sidewalks. The problem is a lot of residents in that area do not want sidewalks. But completing sidewalks in the Honeybrook plat could be a good a way to connect that subdivision to Main Street.

Central Cores

Foley asked if anyone had any recommendations for items that they feel strongly about, items that need to come out or things we can move forward with?

Bachman stated most of the items within their area are lower cost and lower hanging fruit. When you get into things like street signage and furniture, they are lower cost and can be spread out over time. Furniture and signage I believe are things we can start to do right away. Furnishings are things like benches, trash cans, dog litter stations, for example and are things that you see in areas with high foot traffic, it gives a sense of identity and goes along with our standards, specific color, and Clayton logo. And, going along with Randy's department they purchased new sign equipment last year so they will be able to take down the cost of signage significantly by us being able to do them in-house.

Foley asked Bachman and Ms. Williams about reducing speed, making the speed more amicable for pedestrians, is that something you are in agreement with within your committee?

Ms. Williams stated yes, that would be necessary if we are looking to increase pedestrian traffic, we are all in agreement with that.

Bachman stated its within Central Cores but it's also throughout PLAN Clayton and is talked about in other areas. For example, on Main Street create mediums, things that would naturally reduce speeds as well as reducing the speed limit.

Kuntz stated from a development standpoint, reducing speeds is a good thing not just for pedestrians but so people can see the businesses along the corridor. He then asked Sanders what does it take to reduce the speed limits on one of our right-of-ways?

Sanders, Amanda correct me if I'm wrong but I believe it has to go in front of Council. Zimmerlin stated it would ultimately have to go in front of Council but depending on the

road would depend who would do the speed study, and who would make the ultimate decision on whether or not the speed could be reduced. I believe on SR48 we would have the ability to reduce the speed within our boundaries, but we would have to work with the State as well as the city in getting that done. Schweitzer advised reducing the speed on SR48 has come up in the past and the Council at that time voted it down.

Ms. Williams stated reducing the speed on N. Main could prepare people if we were to put in a roundabout or something else in there, it would have already reduced the speed somewhat if we go that route.

Stevens stated my concern with SR48, if we agree and Council agrees to lower the speed limit, I don't believe it would match the street scape along there. If you go out there it looks like a racetrack, 6 or 7 lanes wide, much of it with no sidewalks, no businesses, no curbs, no medium, no roundabouts. I think that's where we will get in trouble with the community, why are we doing this here. I believe we do need to slow the traffic; I just don't know if we'll get the buy-in from the community.

Kuntz stated you would have to reduce the speed when you're making improvements, when you start for example Main Street Phase II or maybe a new street design if you put in a medium, then we have a story to tell on why we reduce the speed.

Foley stated I believe 48 needs to feel more pedestrian friendly. I believe we if can slow traffic perhaps development would come to the city, I know there is a long time between that thought and it actually happening.

Great Streets and Infrastructure

Dorman stated a lot of our ideas intersect with Central Cores and are lower hanging fruit, a lot of planning initiatives that we've thought out. One of primary objectives is a sidewalk infill program. Also, a streetlight program for both primary roads and residential streets. We may have a test candidate for streetlights. Talmadge Road within the old Clayton area only has 3-4 overhead lights which makes the street very dark, they are unsafe and have a low level of lighting. Possibly use them as a test case with our new standardized Clayton branded fixtures. We are also looking into a Gateway program when looking at our city entries. City facilities, let people know you're in Clayton, we have the one at SR48 and Westbrook Road, and look into where we can put others. Create standards for street lighting and furnishing. Infrastructure analysis, we know in some areas we are deficient for water and sewer. Looking at overhead utilities, burying them makes for a more attractive corridor. Possibly doing a City of Clayton thoroughfare plan, identifying our main roads, and what right-of-ways we would like to have when developments occur. Perform a green infrastructure study, ways to do storm water, pipes, soil, landscaping options for stormwater runoff.

Connected Parks

Foley stated his group has a longer term goal in connecting to the Regional Bike Path which currently ends at Riverside and Shoup Mill. This would be a \$8-10 million dollar project that requires a 25% local match. We would need to coordinate with the neighboring communities to share in this project. Metro Parks is trying to take their current paths and fill in the gaps, but we know this is more of a long-term goal. Investigate Hardscrabble Park to see what additional uses could be offered. The same thing goes for Meadowbrook, we agree we need to keep the golf course but could there be any other services added that could benefit the community. We also need to look into the access at Westbrook Park off Westbrook Road. Because of its location, unless you live in that neighborhood you may not know it exists. There was discussion on way finding signage to help residents find the parks, but also discussion on the limited parking at the parks and how to address the overflow parking on residential streets.

Mr. Foley ask Seth to please advise our next steps. Seth stated he will email committee members the final list based on tonight’s discussion. Work with your subcommittee to run through the list of projects and provide preliminary scoring of all projects. Provide your preliminary scoring sheets back to me by May 3rd so I can compare the scores in order to develop a priority list to discuss at the May 5th committee meeting.

V. Next Meeting

Mr. Dorman stated our next meeting is scheduled for May 12, 2021. However, after discussion the board agreed to move the meeting up one week to May 5th and to also start the meeting earlier as the scoring of the projects will take longer. The board agreed to start the May 5th meeting at 6:00 PM.

VI. Adjourn

There being no other business to come before the Committee the meeting adjourned at 8:54 PM.

Dan Foley, *Chair*

Date

Ms. Barbara Seim, *Secretary*

Date